



## STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION STAFF LEGISLATIVE BILL ANALYSIS

Date Amended	<b>04/17/02</b>	Bill No:	<b>SB 1520</b>
Tax:	<b>Soda Tax</b>	Author:	<b>Ortiz</b>
Board Position:	<b>Oppose</b>	Related Bills:	

### BILL SUMMARY

This bill would impose, on and after July 1, 2003, an excise tax upon every distributor, manufacturer, or wholesale dealer at a rate of \$2 per gallon of soft drink syrup or simple syrup and \$0.21 per gallon of bottled soft drinks, and \$0.21 per gallon of soft drink that may be produced from powder, that is sold in this state.

### ANALYSIS

#### Current Law

Under existing law, there is no excise tax on nonalcoholic beverages, beverage syrup and soft drink that may be produced from powder. Sales of such beverages and syrups, however, are subject to the sales and use tax.

#### Proposed Law

This bill would add Part 14.5 (commencing with Section 33001) to Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code to impose, on and after July 1, 2003, an excise tax upon every distributor, manufacturer, or wholesale dealer, calculated as follows:

- Two dollars (\$2) per gallon for each gallon of soft drink syrup or simple syrup sold or offered for direct sale in this state to retail dealers.
- Twenty-one cents (\$0.21) per gallon for each gallon of bottled soft drink sold or offered for direct sale in this state to retail dealers.
- Where a package or container of powder or other base product, other than a syrup or simple syrup, is sold or offered for sale in this state, and the powder is for the purpose of producing a liquid soft drink, then the tax on the sale of each package or container shall be equal to twenty-one cents (\$0.21) for each gallon of soft drink that may be produced from each package or container by following the manufacturer's directions. This tax would apply when the sale of the powder or other base is sold to a retailer for sale to the ultimate consumer after the liquid soft drink is produced by the retailer.

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*

The taxes imposed by this bill would be imposed pursuant to rules promulgated by the State Board of Equalization.

This bill would exempt from the excise tax items such as syrups, simple syrups, powders, or base products, or soft drinks sold to the United States Government, any soft drink containing more than 50 percent natural fruit or vegetable juice, infant formula, beverages sweetened with artificial sweeteners that do not add calories to the beverage, any product used for weight reduction, water, and any product containing milk or milk products.

This bill would also create a trust fund account in the State Treasury called the California Child Health and Achievement Fund. All costs to implement the California Soda Tax Act would be paid from moneys deposited into this fund. All revenue collected from the tax on soft drinks would be deposited into this fund and, upon appropriation by the Legislature, transferred to the Department of Health Services which would allocate the funds as follows:

- Twenty-five percent to school districts for the promotion of nutrition and physical activity in elementary schools in order to advance healthy eating and physical activity as part of a comprehensive school health program, with priority given to school districts with the highest percentage of students eligible for the lunch program.
- Thirty percent for the funding of grants to school districts for middle and high schools that opt to comply with the nutritional standards, as specified, with priority given to school districts with the highest percentage of students eligible for the lunch program.
- Fifteen percent for state and local, community-based obesity prevention programs, and other programs and scientific research related to chronic disease, including cancer, with priority given to low-income communities.
- Fifteen percent for public health programs that promote oral health, including, but not limited to, grants for dental disease prevention programs, with priority given to programs in low-income communities.
- Fifteen percent for the Healthy Families Program for purposes of, but not limited to, childhood obesity prevention and treatment.

As a tax levy, the bill would become effective immediately upon enactment, but the tax would be imposed beginning July 1, 2003.

### **Background**

In 1983, Assembly Bill 105 (Moore) would have imposed an excise tax on the distribution of nonalcoholic carbonated beverages, except carbonated water and carbonated fruit juice, at the rate of seven cents (\$0.07) per gallon. The provisions of that bill also included an excise tax on the distribution of nonalcoholic carbonated beverage syrup at the rate of fifty cents (\$0.50) per gallon of liquid syrup. That bill died in the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*

**COMMENTS**

1. **Sponsor and purpose.** This bill is sponsored by the author and is intended to create programs that promote nutrition and physical activity in schools, prevention and treatment of obesity through health care, obesity and cancer research, and other oral health promotion programs.
2. **Summary of amendments.** The amendments contained in the April 17, 2002, version of the bill revises the method in which moneys transferred from the California Child Health and Achievement Fund to the Department of Health Services shall be allocated. Specifically, priority would be given to school districts with the highest percentage of students eligible for the lunch program and to low-income communities.
3. **Amendments contained in the April 4, 2002 version of the bill** revised the definition of "soft drink" to include any fruit or vegetable drink containing 50 percent or less natural fruit or natural vegetable juice. The introduced version of the bill provided that any fruit or vegetable drink containing 10 percent or less natural fruit or natural vegetable juice constituted a "soft drink." This version of the bill also requires that all moneys deposited in the California Child Health and Achievement Fund, upon appropriation by the Legislature, be transferred to the Department of Health Services which would allocate the funds as specified.
4. **Similar taxes in seven states and in Chicago, Illinois.** Eight states/localities impose an excise, or similar tax on soft drinks. They are as follows:

State/Locality	Year Enacted or Effective	Sales or Other Tax Specifically Applied; Representative Foods Taxed
Arkansas	1992	\$0.21 per gallon of liquid soft drink; \$2 per gallon of soft drink syrups
Chicago	1993	Distributors pay 3 percent on sales of containers, 9 percent on syrups
Missouri	1962	\$0.003 per gallon of soft drinks reduced
Rhode Island	1984	\$0.04 per case (24 12-oz cans) of soft drinks, soda water, mineral water, beer - paid by wholesaler
Tennessee	1963	1.9 percent of gross receipts from soft drinks and soft drink ingredients - paid by manufacturers and bottlers
Virginia	1977	Small excise tax on wholesalers and distributors based on total sales of soft drinks

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*

Washington	1989	\$1 per gallon of syrup
West Virginia	1951	\$0.01 per half liter of carbonated and non-carbonated soft drinks, fruit drinks, and chocolate milk and \$0.80 per gallon of syrups paid by manufacturers or wholesalers

4. **Operative date of the tax should be clarified.** Proposed Section 33005 contains language which appears to impose a floor stock tax on a manufacturer's, dealer's, and distributor's inventory on July 1, 2003. However, the proposed section is intended by the author to provide the operative date of the tax, not a floor stock tax. As such, it is suggested that proposed Section 33005 be amended to clarify the author's intent. Board staff is willing to work with the author's office in drafting appropriate amendments.
5. **Suggested technical amendments.** This bill provides that the taxes imposed by this bill would be imposed pursuant to rules promulgated to the State Board of Equalization. However, in order for the Board to administer the proposed excise tax under provisions consistent with other Board-administered fees, it is suggested that the following section be added to this bill:

33004.5. (a) The State Board of Equalization shall administer the tax imposed pursuant to this chapter in accordance with the Fee Collection Procedures Law (Part 30 (commencing with Section 55001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code). For purposes of administration of the tax pursuant to this chapter, references in the Fee Collection Procedures Law to "feepayer" and "fee" shall include "taxpayer" and "tax."

In addition to the suggested administrative language, the bill should be amended to specify a due date for the fee and return, authorize the payment of refunds on overpayments of the fee, and authorize reimbursement for the Board's costs of administration. Board staff is willing to work with the author's office in drafting appropriate amendments.

6. **This bill would increase state and local sales and use tax revenues.** Under current Sales and Use Tax Law, the total amount of the sale is subject to sales or use tax unless specifically exempted or excluded by law. Because the excise tax imposed pursuant to this measure is not specifically exempted or excluded, it would be included in the total amount of the sale and, therefore, subject to sales or use tax.

In order to be reimbursed for the excise tax, distributors, manufacturers, or wholesale dealers may request payment for the excise tax from the retailer to whom the distributor, manufacturer or wholesale dealer sells. Thereafter, this cost would be reflected in the retail sales price of beverages sold to the ultimate consumer, and would be subject to the sales and use tax. The impact on state and local sales and use tax revenues is discussed in the Revenue Estimate.

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*

**COST ESTIMATE**

The Board would incur non-absorbable costs to develop and administer a new excise tax program. These costs would include registering taxpayers, developing computer programs, mailing and processing returns and excise tax payments, conducting audits, adopting regulations, training staff, and answering inquiries from the public. A cost estimate of this workload is pending.

**REVENUE ESTIMATE****Background, Methodology, and Assumptions**

According to industry sources, the total sales of soft drinks in the US for 2000 amounted to 17.2 billion gallons. Sales of diet soft drinks, water, fruit juices, and dairy products would be exempted in this bill from the excise tax. Total sales in the US of these types of soft drinks are estimated to be 5.1 billion gallons. Therefore, non-diet soft drinks comprise 12.1 billion gallons.

California comprises 12 percent of the total population in the US. Total consumption of soft drinks in California that qualify under this proposal is estimated to be 1.5 billion gallons (12.1 billion gallons x 0.12). It is further estimated that of the 1.5 billion gallons consumed, 1.4 billion gallons comprises the carbonated soft drink (CSD) segment of the market. This market is further divided into two subsegments: bottled product and syrup. Of the 1.4 billion gallons of the CSD segment, 1.2 billion gallons (1.4 billion gallons x 0.85) comprises the bottled portion of the market while 200 million gallons (1.4 billion gallons x 0.15) comprises total soft drink sales from syrup. Since one gallon of syrup constitutes 5.8 gallons of soft drink, the total gallonage of soft drink syrup is estimated to be 34.5 million gallons (200.0 million gallons / 5.8 gallons).

The remaining soft drink market comprises 100.0 million gallons of product and includes non-carbonated soft drinks, for example, energy drinks and sports drinks. Combined with the bottled CSD market, the total bottled segment of the market in California is estimated to be 1.3 billion gallons (1.2 billion gallons of CSD + 100 billion gallons of NCSD).

In addition to the revenue generated by the excise tax, it is also assumed that this tax would be subject to the sales and use tax and would result in an estimated revenue increase of \$27.1 million (\$342 million x 0.0792).

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*

### Revenue Summary

The revenue gain from imposing a \$2.00 per gallon excise tax soft drink syrup and a \$0.21 per gallon excise tax on bottled soft drinks is estimated to be:

Type of Product	Total Gallonage	Tax Per Gallon	Total
Soft Drink Syrup	34.5 million	\$2.00	\$ 69 million
Bottled	1.3 billion	\$0.21	\$ 273 million
Total			\$ 342 million

The revenue gain from an additional \$342 million subject to the sales and use tax is estimated to be:

	Revenue
State Gain (5.00%)	\$ 17.1 million
Local Gain (2.25%)	\$ 7.7 million
Special District Gain (0.67%)	\$ 2.3 million
Total Sales Tax Gain	\$ 27.1 million

---

Analysis prepared by:	Cindy Wilson	916-445-6036	04/26/02
-----------------------	--------------	--------------	----------

---

Revenue estimate by:	Tim Wahl	916-445-0840
----------------------	----------	--------------

---

Contact:	Margaret S. Shedd	916-322-2376
----------	-------------------	--------------

sf

1520-3CW.doc

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.*